



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

percepi possint). II 2. 8 (*plenius praecipueque praeceptoris*); 4. 1; 30; 6. 1; 12. 4 (*virtutum vitiorumque vicinia*); 16. 8; 21. 9. X 1. 44 (*differentia disseram diligentius*); 59; 3. 2; 5. 21 (*consuetudo classium certis*); 7. 6.

b) Between adjective and noun occurs 6 times in bk. I, 5 in bk. II, 9 in bk. X.

c) Between subject and verb, 3 times in I, 2 in II, and 4 in X.

d) Between object and verb, 7 times in I, 0 in II, and 6 in X.

e) Between verb and adverb, I 1. 27; 3. 4; 5. 58; 7. 15; II 1. 7; 5. 15; 10. 15; X 1. 110; 6. 7; 7. 29.

f) Between verb and infinitive, I 10. 26; 33; 11. 11; II 1. 12; 2. 14 (*componere conamur*); 3. 11; 4. 12; 40; 5. 13; 13. 1; 17. 27; X 1. 44; 5. 17.

g) Between two verbs, I 12. 4 (*reficiat ac reparat*); X 5. 17 (*reficit ac reparat*); 7. 17 (*exprimit et expellit*).

h) Between two nouns, I 12. 7; 2. 4. 21; 38; 5. 5; 10. 3. 28; 7. 2.

i) Between two adjectives, 1. pr. 10; 1. 31 *inoffensa atque indubitata*; 4. 29; 5. 14; 6. 20 *abolita atque abrogata*; 15. 1; 10. 5. 21.

j) Between two adverbs, 1. 3. 1 *facile et fideliter*; 2. 5. 19 *statim et semper*.

Alliteration also plays a prominent part in Ausonius and in several of the Christian writers, notably Commod., Paulinus Pell., Cl. M. Victor, and Prudentius, in the last of whom it is to be considered a marked characteristic of his style.

Oct. 12, 1900.

EMORY B. LEASE.

Kaiser Julian der Abtrünnige; seine Jugend und Kriegsthaten bis zum Tode des Kaisers Constantius (331-361); eine Quellenuntersuchung von Dr. WILHELM KOCH. Besonderer Abdruck aus dem fünfundzwanzigsten Supplementband der Jahrbücher für classische Philologie. Verlag von B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, 1899. 160 pp. M. 5.

The life of the Emperor Julian is a drama of which the second act has failed to fix the general attention. Philosophers, theologians and phil-Hellenes have succumbed to the fascination of tracing the threads of a mind whose variegation was truly Ionian; they cheerfully resigned to historians the episode of the Gallic campaigns. From Tillemont in the seventeenth century to Naville and Boissier, Julian has been the theme of at least seventy publications,¹ but it is only fourteen years since Hecker (Programm,

¹ See W. Vollert's (incomplete) bibliography in his *Kaiser Julians religiöse und philosophische Ueberzeugung* (Gütersloh, 1899), published since Koch's work.

Kreuznach, 1886) inaugurated the critical study of the sources of his biographers. Hecker's analysis was mainly concerned with the versions of Julian's military exploits to be found in Ammianus Marcellinus, in Libanius, in Eunapius and Zosimus (who may be taken as one), and in Julian himself. It is true that, as early as 1871, Sudhaus (Diss. Bonn.) maintained a common source for Ammianus and Zosimus, but his conclusions attracted little attention.¹ Hecker, on the other hand, by founding a definite theory on debatable evidence, opened a controversy to which Koch has here contributed the latest, but by no means the last, word. Hecker's thesis, which divided the students of Julianic literature into two camps, was that, in addition to his lost *βιβλίδιον*, which, according to Eunapius (frag. 9), was wholly concerned with the battle of Strassburg, Julian composed 'Commentaries,' modelled on Caesar's, and that these were the main source for Ammianus, for the *ἐπιτάφιος* of Libanius, and for the 'Historia nova' of Zosimus; in short, Hecker asserted that the 'Haupt-Quelle' for Julian's biographers is Julian himself. Hecker was followed by Koch, who in his doctor's dissertation (*De Iuliano imperatore scriptorum qui res in Gallia ab eo gestas enarrarunt auctore disputatio*, Arnheim, 1890) supported the main contention as to the existence and use of the 'Commentaries,' though in details he declined to go all the way with Hecker. Between Koch's dissertation and his present work appeared an admirable article by von Borries (Hermes, 1892), who repudiated the evidence for any such work as the 'Commentaries.' To reproduce his arguments would be beyond the compass of this review. He agrees with Koch and Hecker that Ammianus used the monograph on the 'Alammanen-Schlacht,' regularly cited as the *βιβλίδιον*, the work which earned for Julian at the court of Constantius the nicknames 'loquacem talpam' and 'litterionem Graecum gesta secus verbis comptioribus exornantem' (Amm. XVII 11, 1). This lost monograph, together with certain lost letters of Julian, von Borries calls 'Quelle A.' It is generally agreed that Ammianus did not use the extant Epistula ad Athenienses. Eunapius (216, 6 Dindorf) definitely asserts that Oribasius, Julian's physician, contributed to his history his memoirs of Julian *ὑπόμνημα συνετέλει πρὸς τὴν γραφήν*. According to von Borries, Ammianus also drew on Oribasius, but indirectly, in a version whose authorship he does not attempt to decide. For Oribasius as 'Quelle B,' Koch would substitute Julian's 'Commentaries,' and here he joins hands with Hecker. But why should Eunapius have been content to use and quote

¹ Yet, by reading Sudhaus, Hecker would have been saved from a curious blunder, for which he is ridiculed by Mendelssohn (ed. Zosimus, p. xlvii): oblitus est addere vir doctissimus consensum illum inter Ammianum et Zosimum etiam post mortem Iuliani continuari. quodsi ea concordia cum Heckero explicanda sit eo quod Iuliani commentarios uterque expilaverit, necesse est ut Iuliano praeter alias virtutes etiam ea obtigerit, ut non solum vitae sed etiam mortis propriae narrator fuerit. Sudhaus had pointed out that the agreement lasted after Julian's death.

Oribasius, if a work by Julian on the same period had been available? "Eunapius," says Koch (p. 337), "würde nicht im Stande gewesen sein eine so gediegene Arbeit, wie die Julians gewesen sein muss, zu verarbeiten . . . dergleichen Leute können nicht einmal die guten Quellen, die ihnen vorliegen, lesen, weil sie kein Interesse daran haben." The argument from silence never should be pressed, but it is hardly conceivable that Eunapius should not have mentioned Julian's 'Commentaries,' had they existed, as he mentioned the *βιβλίδιον* in frag. 9.

There are two ways of arriving at the conclusion that Julian wrote 'Commentaries.' With Hecker one may read into Eunapius and Zosimus a reference to such a work. Koch is not inclined to follow Hecker in his theory that Eunap., frag. 9, contains a reference to other works of Julian than the *βιβλίδιον*; he agrees with von Borries that since Zosimus, III 2, 4, is but a paraphrase of Eunapius, frag. 9, the *λόγοι* mentioned by him can not, as Hecker thinks, refer to 'Commentaries.' On the other hand, Eunapius (frag. 14) speaks of a certain Cyllenius who had attempted to write of Julian's military achievements. Julian, says Eunapius, wrote a letter to Cyllenius reproaching him with inaccuracies, and describing the events as they actually occurred. In this letter to Cyllenius, Koch (p. 337) would see the introduction to a larger historical work, a continuation of the Strassburg monograph.

While, however, he maintains Hecker's thesis, Koch is more cautious in his use of the evidence; e. g. he agrees with von Borries that the *βιβλίον περὶ τῶν ἔργων* to which Eunapius refers is probably identical with the *βιβλίδιον*, whereas Hecker sees here an indication of separate 'Commentaries' by Julian. Koch now withdraws certain suggestions made in his dissertation and criticised by his reviewers, Hecker, Kaerst and Klebs. He gives up (p. 339) the emendation that he proposed for Ammianus, XVI 5, 7 (*tractavit* for Wagner's *amavit*). Ten years ago he saw a reference to Julian's 'Commentaries' in Libanius, I 412 R. and ib. Ep. 525, but now prefers (p. 342) the more conservative view of von Borries. On p. 336 he withdraws his bold suggestion of *Ἀλαμμανῶν* for *Ναρδινῶν* in Eunap., frag. 14.

On the whole Koch prefers the second method of proof, and appeals to internal evidence. In Hermes, 1892 (pp. 176-187), von Borries tried to show by parallels that Ammianus and Libanius in the *ἐπιτάφιος* drew from the same source, and that this source was the *βιβλίδιον*, since the agreement ended with the battle of Strassburg. Koch asserts that Libanius used not only the *βιβλίδιον*, but also Julian's 'Commentaries' that dealt with events later than the battle of Strassburg. He repeats his earlier assertion (Jahrbücher, 1893) that parallels with Libanius can be traced through two books of Ammianus after they have ceased for von Borries. To point out indubitable parallels between the rhetorical *ἐπίδειξις* of Libanius and the plain tale of Ammianus is obviously an illusive enterprise. In a difference of opinion where so much is made to hang on resemblances so shadowy, neither

Koch nor von Borries is convincing, and if the existence of the *βιβλίον* depended on this sort of proof we should be reduced to the agnosticism in which we are landed by Koch's affirmation and von Borries' equally emphatic denial of the existence of 'Commentaries.' Koch tries to strengthen his position by the aid of Zonaras. His argument may be reduced to the following: Ammianus and Zonaras conflict; Oribasius was the source for Zonaras; therefore Ammianus did not use Oribasius; therefore he used the 'Commentaries' of Julian. Unfortunately the premises do not stand examination, but there are few fences too high for the Hecker-Koch hobby.

Koch's analysis of the sources, throughout which he assumes the 'Commentaries,' extends from Julian's youth to the death of Constantius, and deserves a more detailed criticism than can be given here. In his discussion of the relations of Constantius and Julian he is on the side of Constantius, whom he regards as the benevolent kinsman whose excellent motives were distorted by the court-party and regularly misinterpreted by Julian.

In spite of Naber's arguments (*Mnemosyne*, N. S., vol. XI, 1883) for placing the death of Iamblichus as late as 361, scholars are fairly unanimous in rejecting the correspondence with Iamblichus. But his influence on Julian is unquestioned, and it is curious that Koch omits all mention of him in tracing the development of Julian's interest in Neoplatonism and thaumaturgy. It is a moot-point whether Julian twice visited Greece. Vollert, who (*op. cit.*, p. 26) uncritically quotes Ep. 40 to Iamblichus as Julian's, repeats (p. 23) the tradition based on Eunapius that Julian twice went to Athens, his first visit dating immediately after his intercourse with Maximus at Ephesus. Koch, however (p. 362), in spite of Eunap. *Vit. Soph.*, p. 74, concludes that he visited Greece only once, in 355, after the death of Gallus.

That the weakness of the evidence for Julianic 'Commentaries' is not sufficiently recognized has been demonstrated recently in the last volume of Croiset's *Histoire de la littérature grecque*, where Maurice Croiset, with singular carelessness, writes (vol. V, p. 897): "Nous l'aurions sans doute trouvé (le vrai Julien), très vivant et très naturel, dans les *Commentaires* qu'il avait écrits sur ses campagnes de Gaule, s'ils nous étaient parvenus," and proceeds to cite Eunap., frag. 9, which even Koch rejects as evidence.

Koch's work was translated by himself from the Dutch, for the sake of a wider circulation. There are some bad misprints: *σωφροσύνης* (p. 354), *propagationem* (p. 442), and certain misplaced accents and breathings, are harmless irregularities; false references, e. g. 1883 for 1893 (p. 343), are more irritating. A really serious fault on the part of the author is that he quotes his authorities, Eunapius, Libanius, etc., in a German version, a peculiarly undesirable habit where the slightest variation of phrase in the original is of importance.

WILMER CAVE FRANCE.